REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23-26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Blume (US 2004/0056900 A1) ("Blume"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited reference fails to anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23-26, and 29.

Blume discloses a method and apparatus "for window priority rendering in graphical user interface applications include[ing] calculating and assigning window priority to a plurality of windows using priority rendering algorithms, and drawing the windows with the calculated window priority." (Blume, paragraph [0003], lines 21-24) Blume specifically "renders" windows according to window priorities.

With respect to independent claim 1 in the presently claimed invention, Applicant teaches and claims:

> "A method, comprising assigning a priority level to a window in a windows-based environment, and *compressing the image data residing in the window* if the priority level of the window falls below a predetermined threshold priority level." (Claim 1) (Emphasis added)

Applicant asserts that Blume does not anticipate claim 1 of the presently claimed invention at least because Applicant's invention specifically relates to "compressing" the image data within a window and Blume's invention specifically relates to "rendering" the image data within a window. Rendering an image is dissimilar to compressing image data. These two concepts are not the same or even similar in what they accomplish. Furthermore, no where within Blume's invention is the term "compress" ever utilized. Thus, because "compressing image data" is in no way similar to "rendering image data," Applicant respectfully submits that Blume does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claim 1.

In regard to independent claims 14 and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume does not anticipate Applicant's invention at least for the same reason as independent claim 1. Again, "compressing image data" is dissimilar to "rendering image data." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 14 and 19.

Claims 3, 5-8, 11, 16, 18, 21, 23-26, and 29 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 14, and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume does not anticipate Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 3, 5-8, 11, 16, 18, 21, 23-26, and 29.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of pending claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23-26, and 29.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Blume, in view of Hiroi (U.S. Patent

No. 6,384,846) ("Hiroi"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 30, and 31.

Hiroi discloses "address[] decoding and simultaneously displaying multiple images in different windows of a PC or other display device such as a television set." (Hiroi abstract) Furthermore, Hiroi discloses that "[w]hen more than two images are displayed, if the total processing load associated with decoding all of the images to be displayed is over 100%, then decoding priority is decided for each image as a function of display window size." (Hiroi abstract)

Claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 30, and 31 depend from and further limit independent claims 1, 14, and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 14, and 19, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume and Hiroi, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 30, and 31.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of pending claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27, 30, and 31.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Blume, in view of Rao (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,415 B1) ("Rao"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in claims 10 and 28.

Rao discloses "[a] closed loop feedback system adaptively control[ling] the compression ratio in a Raster Image Processor." (Rao abstract)

Claims 10 and 28 depend from and further limit independent claims 1 and 19, respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Blume and Rao, each taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or render obvious Applicant's invention as claimed in pending claims 10 and 28.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of pending claims 10 and 28.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 50-0221. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Derek J. Reynolds at (916) 356-5374.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: May 24, 2007

/Derek J. Reynolds/
Derek J. Reynolds
Reg. No.: 60,104

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(916)356-5358